

## REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 21, and 21-23 are pending in this action. In this Response to Office action, claims 3 and 24 are canceled, and claims 1, 2, 23, 32, and 33 are amended.

### *§112 Rejection*

The examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claim 2 has been amended to recite "thermophoretic source." Reconsideration is requested.

### *§102 Rejections*

The examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 21, 23, 25-29, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Merkle (US 2,467,268). Claims 3, 22, and 24 were not rejected in the Office action. Moreover, on the summary page of the Office action, claims 3, 22, and 24 are listed as being objected to. Thus, the subject matter of claims 3 and 24 (or subject matter similar thereto) has been incorporated in claims 1 and 23 respectively. As such, claims 1 and 23, and claims dependent thereon, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 32 has been amended to include subject matter similar to that of claims 3, 22, and 24. Namely, claim 32 has been amended to call for providing a reticle in an antistatic bag. As such, claim 32 is also believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art.

### *§103 Rejections*

The examiner rejected claims 6, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merkle in view of Nazaroff (US 5,061,444). Because claims 6, 30, and 31 depend from independent claims that are believed to be in condition for allowance, the 103 rejections are overcome.

**CONCLUSION**


Although after final rejection, the examiner is kindly requested to enter the amendments set forth in the Claim Amendments section of this paper, as they incorporate subject matter that is not disclosed by Merkle. The examiner is also invited to call the undersigned should he believe doing so would advance the prosecution of this application.

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. The examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

The commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.1019US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 28, 2005

  
Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Customer No.: 21906

Attorneys for Intel Corporation